

Minutes

City of Loma Linda

Department of Community Development

Planning Commission

Chair Neff called a regular meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:05 p.m., **Wednesday, July 21, 2004**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California. He explained that the meeting had been called to properly answer questions that were received at the June 23, 2004 Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioners Present: Randy Neff, Chair
Mary Lee Rosenbaum, Vice Chair
Michael Christianson
Charles Umeda
Rene Sakala

Staff Present: Richard Holdaway, City Attorney
Rolland Crawford, Director/Fire Chief, Public Safety
Jarb Thaipejr, Director, Public Works Department
Lori Lamson, Senior Planner
Jocelyne Larabie, Administrative Secretary

Guest: Lloyd Zola, LSA Associates

ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED

Senior Planner Lamson informed the Commission that Director Woldruff would be absent. Therefore, on behalf of Director Woldruff and herself, she stated that she was pleased to welcome Ms. Sakala to her new position on the Planning Commission. Chair Neff introduced Ms. Rene Sakala who had been appointed to the Planning Commission by City Council on July 13, 2004 and congratulated her on her appointment. Ms. Sakala thanked the Chair and the Commissioners adding that she was looking forward to working with them.

Senior Planner Lamson requested that Item E – Nomination and Appointment of Chair and Vice Chair for the New Term Beginning August 1, 2004, be addressed at the end of the meeting. It was the consensus of the Commission to proceed with Item F.1.

ORAL REPORTS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Cole Smith, 26470 First Street, Bryn Mawr commented on the following issues in regards to Tract Map 15422 project located at the northeast corner of Whittier Avenue and First Street.

- Traffic Study – He asked why a study was not carried out,
- Flood concerns at the end of First Street,
- Train noise mitigation,
- Pedestrian safety,
- Noise/sound study,
- Block wall on the perimeter of the project.

Senior Planner Lamson informed Mr. Smith that the Planning Commission and the City Council had already approved Tract Map 15422, which included all the required environmental studies. She added that the project would be before the Planning Commission on August 4, 2004 as PPD No. 04-05 at which time staff could address his concerns but she assured him that if he would like to come to the Community Development Department, she would be happy to answer his questions regarding the studies that he mentioned.

Mr. Jonathan Zirkle, 24247 Barton Road requested that the public hearings for the Draft General Plan Update be reopened and the draft plan brought before all commissions, committees and boards for further revisions and input.

Chair Neff asked that anyone wishing to comment on the Draft General Plan to please wait for the discussion of the Item F.1.

CONTINUED ITEMS

PUBLIC HEARING

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROJECT The project is a comprehensive update to the City's General Plan, which was originally adopted in 1973. A Draft General Plan document has been prepared based on public input received in various public workshops over the past two years. The draft document has been designed to respond to and reflect the City's changing conditions and community goals in order to guide the City's development during the next twenty years. The project boundaries include all of the City's corporate limits and the Sphere of Influence in the San Bernardino County unincorporated areas generally located south of Redlands Boulevard, east of California Street, south of Barton Road and west of the San Timoteo Creek Channel, and the southeast portion of the South Hills area into San Timoteo Canyon and south to the Riverside County line. The Draft General Plan document addresses issues and sets broad policies related to Land Use, Community Design, Circulation, Economic Development, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Noise, Safety, Public Services and Facilities, and Historic Preservation.

Senior Planner Lamson gave a brief report stating that the discussion of this project had been continued from the meeting of June 23, 2004 to allow time for staff to work with the consultant to address public comments, which had resulted in changes in the text for Mixed-Use Area E and that Mr. Zola would explain what those changes.

Mr. Lloyd Zola, of LSA Associates, explained that the issue that he was asked to comment on was Mixed-Use Area E along Mission Road in regards to the limitations on home occupation uses to address the types of home occupation activities allowed in the original text of the General Plan, which were limited to artisan type activities, and did not include any type of professional uses.

Senior Planner Lamson added that staff felt very comfortable with the changes that Mr. Zola had made to the Draft General Plan.

Mr. Richard Holdaway, Legal Counsel for the City of Loma Linda, informed the Commission that under the Government Code, the Planning Commission was required to have at least one public hearing on the draft General Plan. He continued to say that the public hearing had been closed at the meeting of June 23, 2004, and that the Planning Commission was not required to reopen it. He added that it was the prerogative of the Chair to entertain comments from the public, but the comments should be limited and not be repetitive of previous comments. He continued to say that it was inappropriate for the public to engage in debate with the Commission members or to interrupt the proceedings of the Commission.

Chair Neff stated that the main impetus of the meeting was to address questions that were raised at the Planning Commission of June 23, 2004, which the Commission did not have time to thoroughly address. He continued to say that, as he had received two requests to address the Commission he would allow the individuals to comment very briefly.

Mr. Jonathan Zirkle, 24247 Barton Road, explained that he had sent a letter to Mayor Karen Gaio-Hansberger and distributed copies to the Planning Commission because he wished to discuss its contents. He commented that he had done research regarding the necessity of the City to have prepared a General Plan in a timely manner and added that his research showed that there was some disinformation regarding the penalties to the City if a General Plan was not adopted. He added that his sources at the Attorney General and OPR and HCD stated that there were no penalty provisions in any Code or law of the State of California that would penalize the City for not having an updated General Plan or Housing Element in place in a timely manner. Mr. Zirkle stated that for that reason he was requesting that the process be slowed down to allow further discussion and input before its adoption. He commented that the Trails Development Committee was establishing a South Hills Trails Master Plan that would require amendments to the General Plan.

Chair Neff reiterated that there would be other opportunities for public comment on the Draft General Plan once the Planning Commission had forwarded it to City Council where additional public testimony would be entertained as City Council reviewed the Plan.

Michael Stewart, 25810 Kellogg Street, Loma Linda commented briefly stating that he felt that the mixed-use designation provided development opportunities in the Mission Historic Overlay District and allowed property owners in the South Hills to develop the land that they owned. He stated that he thought it was a good Draft General Plan.

Ted Miller, 24190 Barton Road, stated that he had recently purchased two properties at 24200 and 24208 Barton Road, and expressed his concern that the office use designation would limit his options for business opportunities. Senior Planner Lamson explained that the property

owners of the area had requested the change in designation because the land use had gradually changed over time.

Mr. Miller stated that he had someone who had a particular use for the property and asked if language could be added that would allow other types of land uses along with the office use. Senior Planner Lamson replied that staff would meet with Mr. Miller to help him plan a proposal and justification of why he thought that it would be appropriate to have a different designation.

Chair Neff suggested that Mr. Miller meet with staff to study the Land Use Element and concurred with Ms. Lamson that there would be opportunities to comment when the City Council performs its review of the Draft General Plan.

Richard Holdaway concurred that the community would have an opportunity to address the Council at a public hearing regarding their concerns.

Debra J. Smith, 1040 Ardmore Circle, Redlands, explained that she had been involved with animal rescue and spay and neuter programs for many years and found that there was a growing need for temporary sanctuaries. She stated that she was proposing a sanctuary for the rescue of stray cats but would eventually accept dogs and added that Mr. Miller's property would be an ideal site to build a shelter/sanctuary.

Chair Neff invited Ms. Lamson to recap the process for the update of the Draft General Plan. Senior Planner Lamson explained that in early 2001 a comprehensive General Plan Update began, which included 17 workshops involving the public, the business community, and the City of Loma Linda commissions, committees, and boards, six workshops and 11 public hearings at the Planning Commission level. All meetings and workshops were advertised with banners, the City's website, the Chamber of Commerce, mail outs to a General Plan mailing list, ads in the local newspapers, notices posted at the Loma Linda Library, the Post office on Anderson Street, and City Hall in the foyer.

Ms. Lamson asked Mr. Zola to explain the Office of Planning and Research's (OPR) requirements in the General Plan Process. Mr. Zola explained that the OPR had developed guidelines that required a General Plan to include seven mandatory elements. In regards to possible penalties, he stated that there was no clear penalty, such as a fine or other means, from OPR or the Attorney General for not having an adequate General Plan. He added that the City could be subject to litigation for any project approvals in the absence of an adequate plan and would risk losing control of the General Plan process and its development review process as well as incurring significant legal costs for defending the plan.

Mr. Zola urged the Planning Commission to not recommend the General Plan to City Council if they were uncomfortable with it or if they thought that it was not a fair statement of what is in the best interest of City of Loma Linda.

Chair Neff directed the discussion to the responses to questions from the audience at the June 23, 2004 Planning Commission meeting from Kathy Glendrange, Jonathon Zirkle, Georgia Hodgkin, Wayne Isaeff, and Peter Cowley.

Vice Chair Rosenbaum requested clarification in Question #6 of the staff report: "Would like more residential designations in the Hillside Areas". Senior Planner Lamson replied that the mixed-use designation in the Hillside allowed for different types of residential amenities and styles. Mr. Zola commented that residents were concerned about the amount of commercial development that might occur in the hillside area and stated that if the Planning Commission would like to add language that would stipulate that large-scale retail centers were not the intent of the mixed-use for the Hillside that it would be added to ensure that no such development would occur.

Commissioner Umeda commented on Question 7: "Would like some clarity regarding the phrase "anticipated maximum" density", and Question 8: "The allowable density in the Hillside Mixed-Use Designation area is too high". He asked how the density was calculated. Mr. Zola explained staff moved away from the slope density formula to eliminate issues with developers who would presume that they could achieve the maximum calculated density. He added that several factors came into play to determine the appropriate density for a project before it was taken to the Planning Commission for consideration.

Commissioner Umeda wanted to know the process to calculate what the maximum density should be. Mr. Zola replied that traffic studies were analyzed based on the maximum build-out, which showed the result of traffic flowing out in a limited number of areas and the maximum number of dwelling units that could be built on the site. He continued to say that the existing proposed densities for the flat bench areas on the east end of the hillside area a residential density could be envisioned there. He added that the areas in the Hillside Initiative area would remain as they were.

established by the Initiative, and therefore the hillside areas that were at issue were the hillsides farther back that are not part of the Initiative. Mr. Zola explained that if the density of 2 units per acre were to be applied, the property could be, in the worst-case scenario, divided in ½ acre lots. He continued to say that this was the cluster concept could be applied so that the visible developed area would be of a similar density to the existing subdivisions but with more of the hillside open space being visible and not the rooftops. (Half developed and half in open space).

Mr. Zola explained that if a project with a density of 1 unit per 5 acres were to be approved, the houses would be spread out over a large area and a lot more roadways would be required to reach those homes and the open space areas would then be on private property as opposed to clustering, where the open space would also be clustered in large blocks. He added that staff's recommendation was to consider the concept of clustered development where densities in the cluster to be similar to standard residential subdivisions in exchange for the preservation of open space.

Commissioner Umeda stated that he thought there would be advantages to cluster development, but to deal with the issues that are floating among the public was the 3,000 units based on what the traffic that would flow out these developments. Mr. Zola explained that the number of units at build-out was, from a developer standpoint, on the best of circumstances, the maximum number of units that could be designed but that the maximum number of units, 3,600, in the hillside was not the number that the Planning Commission would be obligated to approve.

Commissioner Christianson stated that the original designation for the hillside area was Estate Residential and that he was concerned that development could get out of hand if the area retained the mixed-use designation. Mr. Zola explained that the primary change was to allow for planned communities and more of a neighborhood setting with its own amenities. He added that it was ultimately the Planning Commission decision to approve or reject any project that was brought before them.

On a question from Commissioner Umeda regarding implementing densities from the General Plan when it was approved, Mr. Zola explained that the Planning Commission would create a zone in the Development Code that would be consistent with the Hillside area and identify the permitted uses within that zone.

Chair Neff asked Mr. Zola if he had any particular statement that he would like to clarify. Mr. Zola summarized that the most common concerns were that of commercial development, the open space trade off of clustering, more specifically the South Hills Trail Master Plan and the density of the Hillside, which the residents found too high. On the issue of the South Hills Trail Master Plan, he explained that there were several ways to address the issue of trails and that he was led to understand that the South Hills Trails Master Plan would be implemented as the General Plan was implemented. If the Planning Commission wished to follow this path, the Implementation Element of the General Plan could be revised to add and adopt policy for a detailed trails plan for that area to make the Trails Plan part of the General Plan.

Mr. Zola stated that on the issue of density, the two units per acre would work well in a cluster concept, but that if the Planning Commission decided that they do not want cluster development, the two units per acre would be way to high. He stated that one unit per two acre with non-cluster development or two units per acre in a cluster development concept would be the two options that the Planning Commission should consider.

Chair Neff wanted to know how the Trails Master Plan should be added to the General Plan. Mr. Zola replied that the Planning Commission, as part of their recommendation to the City Council would recommend to adopt the South Hills Trails Master Plan as the Implementation of the General Plan once the Trails Development Committee finalized the trails master plan.

Chair Neff commented that the existing trails were generally on private property, and wanted to know how the trails master plan would be applied. Senior Planner Lamson stated that a Trails Development Sub-Committee was currently reviewing the trail system and mapping the existing trails throughout the South Hills and providing as much detail as possible so that a Master Plan policy could be adopted with the General Plan that would provide policy on how to preserve trails in the South Hills.

Mr. Zola suggested that language be added in Element 11, in the Parks and Recreation Facilities, Section 11.1(f), that would say: "To meet existing and ongoing recreation needs, the City will complete the following actions: To prepare and adopt a South Hills Trails Master Plan, including provisions for acquisition and maintenance of trails for public use."

Further discussion ensued on the availability of trails as it relates to trails that cross private properties. Mr. Zola pointed out that this was the advantage of a Planned Community development because trails could be made a requirement of the project design.

In response to Commissioner Umeda's question regarding the implementation of a Trails Master Plan in a scenario of one home per acre, Mr. Zola replied that whatever style of development the Planning Commission approved, the implementation would require that a clear right for the public use of trails to be a part of the review process.

Senior Planner Lamson explained that all projects follow the same process and must conform to the Municipal Code and the Development Code and pointed out the importance of establishing guidelines for the development of the South Hills. Mr. Zola added that the process would review the project as it related to the Hillside Mixed-Use policies and identify the type of developments that would fit the vision the City of Loma Linda had for the South Hills and these would include a high level of amenities in a Planned Community setting in exchange for open space and higher densities within the cluster to obtain a variety in design.

Chair Neff asked the Commissioners if they wanted to add a general statement regarding the Trails Master Plan into the General Plan. Commissioner Umeda stated that he would support a policy placed in the General Plan that would require projects to conform to the policy in the General Plan relative to open space and the trail system.

Commissioner Christianson had a question regarding Mixed-Use Area E and he quoted the text in section 2.2.8.5 more specifically the word "encouraged". He commented that at every workshop on the Draft General Plan, the word "intended" had been selected to express precisely what the community was expecting regarding the type of development they wanted to see on Mission Road. Senior Planner Lamson explained that the language was added to the General Plan to expand the Home Occupation process to allow some leniency to properties on the south side of Mission Road. Mr. Zola stated that he had this in mind when he provided the revised language and the examples of live/work communities as directed by the Planning Commission.

A discussion ensued during which Commissioners Christianson and Umeda wished to amend the recommendation to the City Council regarding Tentative Tract Map (TTM) 16730, which was approved on July 7, 2004 meeting. Legal Counsel Holdaway explained that the item was not on the agenda for this meeting, but that staff could relay their concerns to the City Council when the item is heard on July 26, 2004.

An exchange between staff and the Commission ensued regarding the possibility of continuing the discussion on the General Plan Update so that both new Commissioners, Ms. Sakala and Mr. Umeda could have more time to study the contents of the document. Mr. Holdaway explained that the Planning Commission members were not required to know and understand a lengthy document such as the General Plan and they were entitled to rely upon staff and consultants because staff could indicate the next step in the process of approval of a project. He continued to say that there came a time when City Council would be asked to do their part in the revision and approval of the General Plan and could refer the matter back to the Planning Commission if it became appropriate.

Mr. Zola suggested that direction be given to staff and the consultant to prepare language to bring back for discussion and possible final action at the meeting of August 4, 2004. He added that in the interim he could meet with staff and the new Planning Commissioners to review the General Plan to make sure that they are more familiar with the document. If the new Commissioners are still not comfortable with the document, the discussion could be continued again to a special meeting later in August. Senior Planner Lamson suggested that Commissioners Sakala and Umeda prepare a list of questions before meeting with Mr. Zola and herself.

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Umeda, and unanimously carried, to continue the discussion on the General Plan Update Project to the regular meeting on August 4, 2004 to allow some time for the two new Planning Commissioners to familiarize themselves with the Draft General Plan.

Mr. Zola summarized the revisions that had been discussed during the meeting. The revisions would address the following items:

- In the Hillside Mixed-use area, the limitations on commercial and the types that would be approved
- Language regarding amenities and designs if the clustered concept was to be planned
- Implementation measure regarding preparing and adopting a South Hills Trails Master Plan that would include provisions, acquisitions, and maintenance
- Revision of the currently suggested language for Mixed-use Area E to say that a live/work environment was intended

Staff and the consultant agreed to provide further responses to the issues raised oin the letters of comment on August 25, 2004.

PC-04-39 - APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Minutes of the Regular meeting of April 7, 2004

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Rosenbaum, and carried by a vote of 3-2, Commissioners, Umeda and Sakala abstaining, to approve the Minutes of the Regular meeting of April 7, 2004 as presented.

PC-04-40 – NOMINATION AND APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR FOR THE NEW TERM BEGINNING AUGUST 1, 2004

Nomination by Randy Neff, seconded by Rene Sakala, and unanimously carried, to appoint Commissioner Mary Lee Rosenbaum to the position of Chair of the Planning Commission. Commissioner Rosenbaum accepted the nomination.

Nomination by Mary Lee Rosenbaum, seconded by Charles Umeda, unanimously carried to appoint Commissioner Randy Neff for the Vice Chair position. Commissioner Neff accepted the nomination.

REPORTS BY THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

There were no reports by the Planning Commissioners.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT

No reports were presented.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Neff, seconded by Christianson, and unanimously carried to adjourn to the Special meeting of August 25, 2004.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:16 pm

Minutes approved at the regular meeting of January 12, 2005

Administrative Secretary

I:\PlanningCom (PC)\PC 2004\04Jul21M-app.doc